

MAY 07 2004

OFFICIAL Patent
Docket No. 15309-IUS PM/MG/al

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT(S): Denis Faucher
SERIAL NO.: 09/933,798
FILING DATE: August 22, 2001
FOR: INTEGRAL WATERPROOFING MEMBRANE
ART UNIT: 1771
EXAMINER: Ruddock, Ula Corinna
AGENT/ATTORNEY: Paul Marcoux, Reg. No. 24,990 (418-640-5988)

RESPONSE TO ADVISORY ACTION

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Arlington VA 22313-1450


Sir:

In response to the Advisory Action mailed March 23, 2004, a Request for Continued Examination including an Amendment filed therewith and a Petition for Revival are enclosed herewith.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the amount of \$1,050 (covering RCE in the amount of \$385 and Petition for Revival in the amount of \$665), any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to account No. 19-5113.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 5, 2004

By: 
Paul Marcoux, Reg. No. 24,990
Agent of record

OGILVY RENAULT
Customer Number 020988
1981 McGill College, Suite 1600
Montréal (Québec) Canada, H3A 2Y3

Tel: (418) 640-5988

Attorney Document No: 15309-1US PM/MG/alRECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 07 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

OFFICIAL

Applicant: Denis Faucher

Serial No.: 09/933,798

Group Art Unit: 1771

Filed: August 22, 2001

Examiner: Ruddlock, Ula Corinna

For: INTEGRAL WATERPROOFING MEMBRANE

Agent: Paul Marcoux

Tél: (418) 640-5988

AMENDMENT FILED WITH RCEAssistant Commissioner for
Patents and Trademarks
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
U.S.A.

Sir:

This letter is written in response to the Final Action dated July 16, 2003.

Applicant's agent wishes to thank supervisor Terrel Morris for taking time to review this application, a proposed response, and to grant an interview with applicant's agent's representative to discuss the response. At the interview, the question was the allowability of claim 1, the only independent claim in the application, in view of the cited Yamamoto reference. At the interview, and in the proposed response, it was pointed out that, in claim 1, our waterproofing membrane had an impermeable layer adhered to one side of the waterproofing layer while Yamamoto had his impermeable layer (the insulating layer)

- 2 -

adhered to one side of an intervening layer which layer was adhered to the waterproofing layer. Mr. Morris's position was that Yamamoto's impermeable layer was still adhered to the waterproofing layer even with the an intervening layer. It was therefore proposed to amend claim 1 to state that our impermeable layer was directly adhered to the waterproofing layer since this was not shown by Yamamoto. Mr. Morris agreed to this type of amendment would distinguish the claim from Yamamoto. The interview summary is enclosed herewith to be recorded.

Please amend the application as follows: